

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 18 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

ARTEMIO MATEO-GONZALEZ,

No. 17-70387

Petitioner,

Agency No. A206-676-876

v.

MEMORANDUM*

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted March 12, 2019**

Before: LEAVY, BEA, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Artemio Mateo-Gonzalez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") decision dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's order denying cancellation of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

agency's determination that an alien did not establish ten years of continuous physical presence in the United States. *Zarate v. Holder*, 671 F.3d 1132, 1134 (9th Cir. 2012). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Mateo-Gonzalez did not establish the ten years of continuous physical presence required for cancellation of removal, where he did not provide sufficient evidence to meet his burden of proof. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1229b(b)(1)(A), 1229a(c)(4)(A)(i).

Mateo-Gonzalez's contention that the agency ignored evidence is not supported. *See Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 603 (9th Cir. 2006) (alien must overcome presumption that BIA did review all evidence where the BIA plainly stated it reviewed the record). His contention that the BIA did not conduct a meaningful analysis is also not supported. *See Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 2010) ("What is required is merely that [the BIA] consider the issues raised, and announce its decision in terms sufficient to enable a reviewing court to perceive that it has heard and thought and not merely reacted." (citation omitted)).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.